

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re JOSHUA L., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JOSHUA L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A099432

(Sonoma County
Super. Ct. No. 27402-J)

Counsel for appellant Joshua L. has filed an opening brief in which he raised no issues and asked this court for an independent review of the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

An amended juvenile petition was filed on April 25, 2002, seeking to have appellant adjudged a ward of the court (Welf & Inst. Code, § 600 et seq.) because he committed commercial burglary (Pen. Code, §459), petty theft (Pen. Code, §484, subd. (a), and resisted a police officer (Pen. Code, §148(a)). Three days later, appellant admitted the truth of the petty theft violation, and the burglary and petty theft allegations were thereupon dismissed. At the time the admission was made, appellant was admonished of his rights to a hearing, confront witnesses, and subpoena power. He also admitted the factual basis for the violation.

A disposition hearing was held on May 13, 2002, at which time the court declared appellant a ward of the court, and ordered him detained at juvenile hall pending placement.

At all times appellant was represented by counsel. Prior to accepting his admission to the petty theft allegation contained in the amended petition, appellant was fully and correctly admonished of his constitutional rights, which he knowingly and voluntarily waived in open court. He admitted a factual basis for the admission. We find no error in the disposition, and we conclude that there are no meritorious issues to be argued or that require further briefing on appeal.

The judgment is affirmed.

Ruvolo, J.

We concur:

Haerle, Acting P.J.

Lambden, J.